

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF IRAN AND LIBYA SANCTIONS ACT OF 1996.

Section 13(b) of the Iran and Libya Sanctions Act of 1996 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; Public Law 104-172) is amended by striking "5 years" and inserting "10 years".

SEC. 3. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO LIBYA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5(b)(2) of the Iran and Libya Sanctions Act of 1996 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; 110 Stat. 1543) is amended by striking "\$40,000,000" each place it appears and inserting "\$20,000,000".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to investments made on or after June 13, 2001.

SEC. 4. REVISED DEFINITION OF INVESTMENT.

Section 14(9) of the Iran and Libya Sanctions Act of 1996 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; 110 Stat. 1549) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: "For purposes of this paragraph, an amendment or other modification that is made, on or after June 13, 2001, to an agreement or contract shall be treated as the entry of an agreement or contract."

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002—Continued

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on amendment No. 1025, the Murray-Shelby substitute amendment.

Patty Murray, Ron Wyden, Patrick Leahy, Harry Reid, Hillary Rodham Clinton, Charles Schumer, Jack Reed, James Jeffords, Daniel Akaka, Bob Graham, Paul Sarbanes, Carl Levin, Jay Rockefeller, Thomas R. Carper, Barbara Mikulski, Tom Daschle, and Richard Shelby.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I send a second cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the

Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate on H.R. 2299, the Transportation Appropriations Act.

Patty Murray, Ron Wyden, Patrick Leahy, Harry Reid, Hillary Rodham Clinton, Charles Schumer, Jack Reed, Robert C. Byrd, James Jeffords, Daniel Akaka, Bob Graham, Paul Sarbanes, Carl Levin, Jay Rockefeller, Thomas R. Carper, Barbara Mikulski, and Tom Daschle.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, under the unanimous consent agreement we reached yesterday, the vote on cloture will occur tomorrow. We have been working with our colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I appreciate very much Senator MCCAIN's cooperation in trying to reach a mutually convenient time for the vote. Unfortunately, there are other colleagues who are unable on the Republican side to agree to an earlier time for consideration of the bill, even though it was our hope that we could come to the bill at the normal time of convening tomorrow. But that is impossible.

We will have the cloture vote at 1 o'clock. We will reconvene, as a result of the current circumstances, at 12 noon tomorrow. That will accommodate the need for additional discussion among all of those who are participating in the negotiations with regard to the Mexican trucking issue.

I understand we have made some progress this afternoon. I am hopeful we can continue to talk through the night and tomorrow morning as well.

This will facilitate additional discussion and hopefully perhaps reach some conclusion. If it does, we will vitiate the cloture motions. If it does not, of course, the cloture motion votes will then occur at 1 o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

I thank my colleagues. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate now proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators allowed to speak therein for a period of not to exceed 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ALFONSO E. LENHARDT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the day before yesterday I met for the first time Alfonso Lenhardt. I met him in the majority leader's office. We were standing there alone after some niceties. I asked him: What is the pin on your lapel? He said: It is a Purple Heart. It is a medal for being injured in combat. He didn't

say that, but that is what the Purple Heart stands for.

I mention that because I have a lot of affection for the Senate. I have a lot of affection for this Capitol complex. One of the main reasons I have so much affection is that I worked nights as a Capitol Hill policeman while going through law school. I can remember walking through Statuary Hall, never having had any understanding of who those great men were in the true sense of the word. I had the opportunity of meeting Everett Dirksen. I remember walking on the floor. I was the policeman assigned to the Ohio Clock, as it is called. I was there when this man with long, white hair and a wonderful voice, Senator Everett Dirksen, came by. He was asked to comment on the first hydrogen explosion of a nuclear device by the Soviet Union. I stood there and listened to him.

I have fond memories of not only my congressional experience but also as a young man working as a Capitol policeman. My boss was the Sergeant at Arms. The Sergeant at Arms of the House and the Senate are very important positions.

I mention meeting with General Lenhardt because I think we should understand what a great choice this man is to be the Sergeant at Arms of the U.S. Senate. He is a professional in the true sense of the word. Prior to some preliminary issues, Senator DASCHLE never knew the man. His very fine chief of staff, Pete Rouse, and our very excellent Secretary of the Senate, Jeri Thomson, went through the process and came to Senator DASCHLE with a number of people. This is the person that Senator DASCHLE chose. What a great choice. He is a professional.

One of the jobs he had in the U.S. Army was to be the commanding general of the organization that takes care of national security and law enforcement programs.

In 1997, after more than 31 years of domestic and international experiences in national security and law enforcement, he retired from the U.S. Army. His responsibilities in the military were significant. He is a two-star general. I am told that he could have had a third star, but he decided to retire prior to doing that.

His last position with the Army was as commanding general of the U.S. Army Recruiting Command. There were over 1,800 separate locations of which he was the leader. He managed an Army installation consisting of 130,000 acres of training areas, administrative and logistical facilities, and support operations for over 23,000 civilian employees, military retirees, soldiers, and family members.

He also served as the senior military police officer for all police operations and security matters throughout the Army's worldwide sphere of influence.

So to have him at the Senate, having the responsibility, among other things, for the security of this Capitol complex, says it all. He certainly has had

the experience. This man not only has had an outstanding military career, but he has a bachelor of science degree in criminal justice from the University of Nebraska, a master of arts degree in public administration from Central Michigan University, and a master of science degree in the administration of justice from Wichita State University. He also completed executive programs at Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government and the University of Michigan Executive Business School.

He has been active in public service. This is a man who is outstanding. Those who watch the Senate proceedings on C-SPAN or who visit the Capitol, to see this historic site, may not realize all the work that goes into running the U.S. Capitol. The responsibilities are enormous. Unless something goes wrong, we take them for granted.

Senator DASCHLE has done some very fine things during his 7 years as Democratic leader, and he has done some great things during his short time as majority leader, but I think there is nothing that I have been more impressed with than his selection of General Alfonso Lenhardt as the Sergeant at Arms of the U.S. Senate. I hope everyone in the Senate will have the opportunity to meet this man and to recognize what a fine person Senator DASCHLE has selected.

He is going to be our protocol officer and our chief law enforcement officer. He will also be the administrative manager for most of the Senate's wide-ranging support services. We could not have a better person.

THE PATIENTS' BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, the Senate recently passed the Patients' Bill of Rights and we are anxiously awaiting action by the House. The Patient Protection Act, or the Patients' Bill of Rights, is something we have spent a great deal of time on in the Senate.

As Senator DASCHLE indicated, it was one of our top priorities. We had a great deal of difficulty getting it through the Senate. It took us a good number of years to do that, but after 4 or 5 years of debate, we finally got a Patient Protection Act passed by the Senate. We are now waiting for the House to take similar action.

The President says he will veto it. And that is the way the legislative process works. We have to do the best we can to advance public policies that we think strengthen this country. We have done that under the leadership of Senator DASCHLE, with the cooperation of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. We passed a real Patient Protection Act or a real Patients' Bill of Rights. Let me describe why that is important and what it does.

All of us have had lengthy debates about what is happening to health care in this country, as more and more

Americans have been herded into these groups called managed care organizations. They were created, in some cases, for very good reasons, to try to reduce the cost of health care and control and contain the cost of health care.

But in recent years, the for-profit organizations that have become part of the managed care industry have, from time to time, taken actions with respect to patient care that have much more to do with their bottom-line profit than it has to do with patient care.

So we had a debate about a Patient Protection Act that says the following:

One, you ought to be able to know all of your medical options for treatment, not just the cheapest option for medical treatment. That ought to be a fundamental right for patients.

Two, if you have an emergency, you ought to have a right to go to an emergency room. Sound simple? Yes, it is simple. But it is not always the case in this country that with an emergency, you are going to get reimbursement for emergency room treatment by a managed care organization.

Three, you have a right to see a specialist when you need one for your medical condition. Does that sound simple and pretty straightforward? Sure, but it doesn't happen all the time.

You have a right to clinical trials. You have a right to retain, for example, the relationship you have with your oncologist who has been treating you for breast cancer for 7 years. Even if your employer changes health care organizations, you have a right to continue to see the same oncologist who has been treating you for cancer for 7 years.

Those are the kinds of provisions we put in the Patient Protection Act. Let me describe why we did it. We did it because in this country too often patients are discovering that what they believed they were covered for in their medical or health care plan was not in fact covered at all.

I have told the story of the woman who went hiking in the Shenandoahs. She fell off a 50-foot cliff and sustained very serious injuries. She was unconscious. She had multiple broken bones and was in very serious condition. She was brought to an emergency room on a gurney unconscious. She survived after a long convalescence, only to find out that the managed care organization said they would not pay for her emergency room treatment because she had not had prior approval for emergency room care. This is a woman hauled into an emergency room unconscious, told that she should have gotten prior approval for emergency room care.

Does that literally cry out and beg for some kind of legislative attention? Yes, it does. It is just one piece of the Patient Protection Act providing that, if you have an emergency, you have a right to emergency room treatment.

There are so many other examples. For instance, the issue of what is medi-

cally necessary. I have held up pictures on the floor of young children born with terribly deformed facial features, being told that the correction of that radically deformed facial feature is not "medically necessary," and therefore the insurance they thought they had with the managed care organization would not cover it.

I have told the story often of my colleague, Senator REID of Nevada and I, holding a hearing in the State of Nevada on this subject, where we heard from a mother of a young boy named Christopher Roe who died at age 16. Christopher had cancer. This young boy fought cancer valiantly but lost his life on his 16th birthday. In the process of fighting cancer, they also had to fight in order to get the treatment he needed. He didn't get it in time. It is an unfair fight to ask a 16-year-old boy to fight cancer and have to fight the insurance company at the same time.

His mother held up a picture of young Christopher, a big colored poster picture, and cried at the end of her testimony as she described her son looking up at her from the bedside asking: Mom, how can they do this to a kid? What he was asking was: How can they do this? How can they not provide the treatment I need to give me a chance to live? That boy died at age 16.

I have told that story. I have told many other stories, including the story of Ethan Bedrick. Ethan had a very difficult birth and was born with very serious problems because the umbilical cord had shut off his oxygen. A doctor had decided, after evaluating him, that he had only a 50-percent chance of being able to walk by age 5 if he got certain rehabilitative services. A 50-percent chance for this little boy to be able to walk by age 5 was "insignificant," and, therefore, the services were denied.

Does it sound bizarre? Does it sound like a system with which we are acquainted? Not to me. This all sounds just Byzantine, that decisions are made about health care on what is medically necessary, what is an emergency, what kind of treatment is available, what kind of treatment is necessary. Some decisions have been made with an eye toward the bottom line of the corporation providing the health care. And that is wrong because human health is not a function of someone's bottom line.

We had a woman who suffered a very serious brain injury. She was still conscious. She was in an ambulance, and she asked the ambulance driver to take her to the furthest hospital. There was one closer. She wanted to go to the one that was a bit further away. This is someone in an ambulance with a brain injury. She survived and later was asked: Why did you not want the ambulance to drop you off at the nearest hospital? She said: Because I understood the reputation of that hospital. It was their bottom line, their profit; I did not want to be presented on a